

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/635,073	PERINPANATHAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael J. Moore, Jr.	2666	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Allowable

 (1) Michael J. Moore, Jr.

(3) _____.

 (2) Ronald D. Faggetter (Reg. No. 33,345).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 April 2005
Time: 12:00PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Claims 17,18,21,22,23,26,29,30, and 40 were discussed.

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Michael J. Moore, Jr.
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The use of the phrase "adapted to" in these claims as being optional language was discussed with Mr. Faggetter. A suggestion was made by Examiner to change "adapted to" to "configured to" in each of these claims. Mr. Faggetter consulted with Applicant and accepted the suggested change with a return phone call on 4/29/05. These changes are provided in the attached Examiner's Amendment..